

**Remarks**

Claims 16-17 and 20 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 14-15 and 18-19 remain pending in the application.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takizawa (US 6,740,457).

In response, applicant respectfully traverses and submits that claims 18-19 are patentable over Takizawa, as follows:

Claim 18 recites in part:

...the RGB resins cooperatively form a continuous, flat surface opposite to the transparent substrate...forming an ITO (Indium Tin Oxide) layer on the color resin layer...

Applicant submits that Takizawa does not disclose, teach, or otherwise suggest the invention as currently recited in claim 18.

Takizawa does disclose a color filter substrate and method for making the same, an electro-optical device and a method for making the same, and an electronic apparatus (see the title). However, Takizawa does not disclose or suggest a method for manufacturing a liquid crystal display device comprising the steps of: 1) coating a color resin layer comprising RGB resins, such that the RGB resins cooperatively form a continuous, flat surface opposite to the transparent substrate; and 2) forming an ITO layer on the color resin layer.

Applicant asserts, first, that Takizawa simply teaches a color filter substrate (610), in which the colored layers (613r, 613g, and 613b) are all stacked on the reflective light-shielding layers 612B in the light-shielding regions BR of the color filter substrate (610) (column 11, lines 44-48). The stacked color layers are different from the RGB resins recited in claim 18, which cooperatively form a continuous, flat surface opposite to the transparent substrate. Second, in Takizawa, the electrodes (615) are formed on the protection layer (614); whereas in claim 18, the ITO layer is directly formed on the color resin layer. Accordingly, these differences indicate that Takizawa fails to teach or suggest the method for manufacturing a liquid crystal display device as recited in claim 1.

Overall, there is nothing in the cited reference that teaches or suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art that they might or should provide the method of claim 18. Furthermore, the method as recited in amended claim 18 produces new and unexpected results. That is, the method can provide a color filter have low reflectivity on both surfaces thereof. Accordingly, the liquid crystal display device using the color filter provides high brightness and contrast.

In summary, claim 18 is submitted to be not only novel over Takizawa under s.102(b), but also unobvious and patentable over Takizawa under s.103. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 18 are respectfully requested.

Claims 19 depends from claim 18, and therefore should also be allowable.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103**

Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art (admission) in view of Fukuyoshi (US 4,853,296).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, and submits that the invention of claims 14-15 would not have been obvious in view of the cited references. In particular, applicant asserts as follows:

Claim 14 recites in part:

...the joint portions are lapped one over the other above corresponding portions of the black matrix ...

Applicant acknowledges that Fukuyoshi teaches forming an overlapped portion (39) beneath comb portions (32) (column 7, lines 32-33, and see FIG. 11). Fukuyoshi also teaches forming a color filter (15), by patterning a gelatine film by a relief dying process (column 5, lines 42-43, and see FIG. 3). However, in the color filter, the RGB resins have no joint portions lapped one over the other. Therefore, the limitation of "the joint portions are lapped one over the other above corresponding portions of the black matrix" of claim 14 is not found or taught in Fukuyoshi. In the Office action, it is stated that admitted prior art lacks or does not expressly disclose adjoining RGBs and the joint portions being lapped one over the other above corresponding portions of the black matrix. Accordingly, applicant submits that admitted prior art in view of Fukuyoshi do not teach or suggest the limitation of "the joint portions are lapped one over the other above corresponding portions of the black matrix." There is nothing in the cited material that teaches or suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art that they might or should be combined to provide the method of claim 14.

Furthermore, the method as recited in amended claim 14 produces new and unexpected results. That is, the method can provide a color filter having low reflectivity on both surfaces thereof. Accordingly, a liquid crystal display device using the color filter provides high brightness and contrast.

In summary, claim 14 is submitted to be unobvious and patentable under s.103 over admitted prior art in view of Fukuyoshi. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 14 are respectfully requested.

Claim 15 depends from claim 14, and therefore should also be allowable.

Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art and Fukuyoshi (US 4,853,296) in view of Takizawa (US 6,740,457).

In response, applicant has canceled claims 16-17 without prejudice, and the rejections relating thereto are now moot.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Takizawa (US 6,740,457) in view of admitted prior art.

In response to the rejection, applicant has canceled claim 20 without prejudice, and the rejection relating thereto is now moot.

In view of the foregoing, the present application as claimed in the pending claims is considered to be in a condition for allowance, and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sheng-Shiou Yeh et al

By 

Wei Te Chung

Registration No.: 43,325

Foxconn International, Inc.

P.O. Address: 1650 Memorex Drive, Santa Clara, CA 95050

Tel. No.: (408) 919-613